The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Mysore Municipal Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1953, as passed by the Council, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore Municipal Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1953, as passed by the Council, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the City of Bangalore Improvement Bill.

THE CITY OF MYSORE IMPROVEMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1954 AND THE CITY OF BANGALORE IMPROVEMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1954.

Sri T. CHANNIAH (Minister for Public Health and Local Self-Government).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, with your permission I wish to take up both the Bills, namely, the City of Mysore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1954 and the City of Bangalore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1954 together, because the Amendments proposed in these two Bills are alike. I accordingly move :

"That the City of Mysore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1954 and the City of Bangalore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1954, be taken into consideration."

Sir, unrestricted power has been vested in the Trust Boards under Section 29 of the City of Bangalore Improvement Act and Section 25 of the City of Mysore Improvement Act with the result that it has not been possible for Government to exercise a certain measure of control in regard to the disposal of sites. Therefore certain amendments have been brought to enable Government to exercise some control over these Boards. One of the reasons for suggesting the amendments is that huge sums of money which have been advanced to these Trust Boards are locked up and Government are vitally interested in prompt repayment of the advance. Since the publication of the Bill, it has been represented to Government that if the Bill is passed into Law the Trust Boards would be absolutely powerless. It was, therefore, suggested to Government that the Trust Board should have the power to dispose of sites at upset price and that cases of free grant may be referred to Government by the Trust Board for sanction. On further consideration, Sir, Government thought that the Trust Boards should have the power to dispose of sites at rates fixed in respect of certain schemes and that power to sanction free grants should be vested in Government. The amendment reads as follows.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendments can be moved later on.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—Sir, I move that these two Bills be taken into consideration by the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That the City of Bangalore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1954, be taken into consideration."

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN (Chamarajapet).—Sir, I welcome this Bill. The amendments are for sub-sections (1) and (2) of the original Act. But actually, it is not so. 29 (1) is already in the original Act. But it has been recast now as (a), (b) and (c). I would just take up the original Act and read Section 29 for the information of the House. Section 29 of the City of Bangalore Improvement Act, 1945, reads as follows :

"The Board shall, for the purposes of this Act, have power to acquire and hold movable and immovable property, whether within or without the City, and shall also, subject to the provisions of this Act, have power—

(1) to let on hire, or lease any movable or immovable property which may have become vested in or acquired by them;

(2) to sell and otherwise convey, with or without any

conditions, any movable or immovable property which may have become vested in or acquired by them; and

(3) to appropriate or apply the whole or any part of the lands which may have become vested in or acquired by them, for the formation of open spaces, or for building purposes, or in any other manner for the purposes of any improvement scheme."

There is no change at all now. Instead of clauses (1), (2) and (3), it has now been brought as (a), (b) and (c). So it is not an amendment at all, but it has only been recast and brought under Section 29.

We feel that sub-section (1) itself of section 29 almost gives power to the Trust Board to run a parallel municipality, but when we actually take the original Act itself, we see that there is no amendment. It has only been recast.

As regards sub-clause (2), the Hon'ble Minister has been kind enough to bring an amendment. In fact I had sent an amendment requesting this House to delete the whole sub-clause. The sub-clause as found in the Bill now before us reads like this:

"(2) No free grant of movable or immovable property and no sale or other transfer of immovable property except a sale of such property through public auction, shall be made without the previous sanction of Government being obtained in this behalf."

Sir, this sub-clause actually takes away the power of the Trust Board. You are aware, Sir, that the Trust Board consists of five nominees of the Government, one of whom is a Chairman. There are only four elected representatives of the Corporation of the City of Bangalore. Actually, the Government will be in a majority. I do not know why this sub-clause (2) has been introduced. In fact, whatever little power was given to this Trust Board will be taken away by this change. For every sale of immovable property, etc., they have to await the decision of the Government. Sometimes it may take a very long time. It would have been better if sub-clause (2) had not been introduced at all. In these days of Democracy, when we are thinking of giving more power to non-official bodies like the Trust Board and the Corporation, I do not know why the Government should take away the power already there. Two years back such an amendment was brought for the Corporation Act itself. Then there was so much of trouble. I do not know why such an amendment should be brought now and the powers already enjoyed by the local and statutory bodies taken away. Is it because Government suspects the Board or the Corporation, etc? I do not know why they should introduce such an amendment. But the Hon'ble Minister has stated that it has been brought in respect of free grant where previous sanction of Government is necessary and in respect of other lands sold at upset prices, there is no necessity for the previous sanction of the Government. It may be that the Hon'ble Minister has been misinformed that the Trust Board gives away the land free of cost to the people. It is not so. I also served on the Board for about three or four years. During that period, the Trust Board never parted with properties free of cost. Even when the Board recommended that the sites should be sold at an upset price, it had to await the sanction of Government approving our proposals. Only after the approval of Government was obtained, sites were given. I feel that there is a misapprehension in the mind of the Hon'ble Minister. The members of the Trust Board are the nominees of the Government. Why should they be suspected like that? I do not know why they are pressing this sub-clause, because it actually takes away the power already there.

I do not want to say much. Regarding the land sold for upset price, the actual practice in the Trust Board is, the land will be sold at an upset price and the whole thing is recommended to the Government. After the Minister gives approval, the lands are alienated.

(SRI R. ANANTARAMAN.)

Otherwise, it will not be given to the parties allotted. The Hon'ble Minister may feel that there is some lacunæ in the Trust Board rules itself and that the whole thing may be challenged by one of the members. So by way of caution, he has brought this amendment.

With these few words, I support the Bill.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Mysore City North).—Sir, the Minister in charge of this Bill, by his opening speech has unnecessarily given room for comments. I agree entirely with my friend, Sri Anantaraman. The measure itself is uncalled for. When I read the amendment I thought it was an improvement upon the old Section—Section 29, in the case of the Bangalore City Improvement Trust Board Act, and old Section 25 in the case of the Mysore City Improvement Trust Board Act. But on a careful perusal of the Act, I found that practically there was no improvement. But when we further read sub-clause (2)—The whole trouble lay in this sub-section. I do not want to say anything more than what I would call it as mere trouble. But that, Sir, is indeed a very retrograde measure. From 1903 onwards there was not a single instance in which the Trust Board of Mysore had any occasion to be pulled up by the Government. On all occasions in which they granted sites free, they had obtained the prior approval of Government. In all cases in which they had to transfer or sell sites to individual rate-payers, they had the schedule of rates approved beforehand.

Sir, the very constitution of the Trust Boards is designed in such a manner that it should function as a part of Government, though statutory recognition is given to that body. The majority of the members are nominated and the representatives of the local Municipal Council are in a minority. Moreover, the very scheme of the Trust Board is to improve the city or to acquire land, form layouts, get them approved by Government and then sell them to the people. When that work is over, they will have to hand it over to the Municipal Council. This is the basis on which the Trust Board Act is framed. Therefore, to restrict the right of the Trust Board in disposing of the sites for which schedule of rates has already been fixed, would be to nullify what was intended in the Act. Sir, if sub-section 2 is to be passed by this House, it is as good as abolishing the Trust Board. As Sri Anantaraman put it, instead of liberalising the Act, the Government really restrict it by this amendment. I have said that the Minister's speech has lessened the controversy. He has seen the reasonableness of the amendment which I have already tabled and he himself is in entire agreement with the amendment. Otherwise, the normal function of the Trust Board would be restricted and that is not the intention of the Government either. Having been allowed certain powers to the Trust Board, it is not correct, to put it mildly, to restrict it further. I have also served on the Trust Board of Mysore for a number of years and there is a standing rule that for the grant of free sites, previous sanction of Government should be obtained and it is adhered to all these 51 years. I, on my part, would not object the free grant of land being made subject to the approval of Government and that is what is being done now. What is being done under a rule has been given a statutory recognition. I hope the Minister would accept this amendment. With these few words, Sir, I hope the Minister in charge of the Bill would accept this amendment and make it less restrictive.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್ (ನೆಲಮಂಗಲ—ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿಗಳು). —ಈ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಎಂಬುದು ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಮುಂತಾದ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಚಿಕ್ಕದಾದ ಮತ್ತು ಕೆಲವು ಕಾಲ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಒಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಜನಗಳ ಸೇವೆ ನಲ್ಲಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಬೆಳೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವ ನಗರಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೌಕರ್ಯ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯವರು ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್‌ನವರ ಸ್ಕೀಮುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಹಂಚಲು ಸಹಾಯವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಇಂಥ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ರ್ಪಡಿಸಿ ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಗ್ಯಾರಂಟಿನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು ಒಂದು ಮಾರ್ಗ. ಆದರೆ ಫೈನಲ್ ಅಥಾರಿಟಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕಿರುವುದು ಸಹಜವಾಗಿಯೇ ಇದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ವಿಧವಾದ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಎಂಬುದು ಒಂದು ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ

ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಮಾರಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಹೇಗೆಂದರೆ ಅನೇಕ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಗ.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯ (ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).— ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಅದು ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಮಾರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್.— ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ನಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕೆಲಸವಿದ್ದಾಗ, increase of duties ಇದ್ದಾಗ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಎಂಬ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯು ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯಮಾಡಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯ ನೀಡಲೆಂದು ಆ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಸೈಟನ್ನು ಫಾರಂಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ಮನೆಕಟ್ಟಿಸುವುದು ಮುಂತಾದ ಮುಂದಿನ ಕೆಲಸ, ಸೈಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಡಿಸ್‌ಪೋಸ್‌ಮಾಡುವುದು—ಈ ಬಾಬುಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ವಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ನಿಗೆ ಆ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ವಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡು ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಮಾರಿಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವಿದೆ. ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯವರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಕೆಲಸದಮೇಲೆ ಫೈನಲ್ ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲ್, ಡಿಸ್ಪೆಡಿಂಗ್‌ವಾಯ್ಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇದೆ. ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಜನರ ಸೇವೆಮಾಡಲು ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾದುದೆಂದು ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಸೈಟು ಕೊಂಡವರು ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು, ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ನೀಡುತ್ತದೆಯೆಂಬುದು ಅನುಭವ. ಈಗ ಆಕ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಾವಿಷ್ಟ್ ಇದ್ದಾಗ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕು, ನಿಧಾನವಾದರೂ ತಡೆಯಿರಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಂಡರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕಿರುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ.

ಆಮೇಲೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯ. ಈಗ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಸೈಟುಗಳನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕವರ್ಟ್‌ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲಸವಾದಮೇಲೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಂಚುತ್ತದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಆ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾದ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು ವಹಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಅನೇಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ರೇಟ್‌ಪೇಟ್ ಥಾರ್ಜು ಆಗಿರುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಶಿಫಾರ್ಸು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಾವು ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಿಸಿರುವಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಅಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹಿಂದು ಮುಂದು ನೋಡುವ ಸಂಭವವಿದೆ. ಆಗ conveniences are preferable to cost ಎಂಬ ನೀತಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು, ಏಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಊಹೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. 25 ಜನರು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದನ್ನು, ನಾರ್ಮಲ್ಲಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರ ಕೈಲಿ ಕೂಡ weapon of adjustment for better management ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡವರು ವಾಸಮಾಡುವ ಜಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಡವರೂ ಸಹ ವಾಸಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಚಿಕ್ಕ ಚಿಕ್ಕ ಸೈಟುಗಳನ್ನುಮಾಡಿ ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಶ್ರೀ ದಾನಪ್ಪನವರಿದ್ದಾಗ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಅಂಥ ಜಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ರೇಡಿಯೋ, ಲೈಟು ಮುಂತಾದುವುಗಳ ಸೌಕರ್ಯವಿರುವುದು ಬಡವರಿಗೂ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಇಂಡಸ್ಟ್ರಿಯಲ್ ಸಬರ್ಬಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. It is one of degree, not of kind. ಒಂದು ಬಂಗಲೆಗೆ 20 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕಟ್ಟಿದರೆ ಬಡವರು $1\frac{1}{2}$ ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನಾದರೂ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು, ಅನುಕೂಲತೆಗಳು ಅವರಿಗೂ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆವು. ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅರಿಸ್ಟೋಕ್ರಟಿಕ್ ಜನರಿರುವ ಕಡೆ ಬಡವರಿಗೂ ಸಹ ಒಂದು ಅಂಕಣದಷ್ಟಾದರೂ ಮನೆಯಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಆಸೆ. ಆ ಆಸೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಗತವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಅಮಾಲಿಯೊರೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಹೇಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾದೀತು? ಬಡಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಮಿಡ್ಲ್‌ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಜನರಿಗೆ, ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರಿಗೆ, ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟೇಬಲ್ಲುಗಳು ಮುಂತಾದವರಿಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕ ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅನುಕೂಲವಿರುವಂತೆ, ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ಲಾಗಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಕೈ ಹಾಕಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕು.

ಅಮಾಲಿಯೊರೇಷನ್ ಆಫ್ ಡಿಪ್ರೆಸ್ಡ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸಸ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಕಲ್ಪನ ಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕ. 2 ಸಾವಿರ ಸೈಟುಮಾಡುವಾಗ at least 500 sites should be reserved for being disposed of to teachers, constables, etc., irrespective of caste and creed. ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ what justice is there? ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾವಿಷ್ಟ್‌ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೈಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಅಗತ್ಯ.

ಅಂತೂ ಅವರು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ, ಇದೊಂದು 'ಚೆಂಪೊರರಿ ಬಾಡಿ' ಎಂಬುದೇನೋ ಸರಿ. ಆದರೂ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ನೀವು ಹಾಕಿರುವ ದುಡ್ಡು ಪೊಲಿಟಿಕಲ್ ಸಫರರ್ಸ್ ಎಂತಲೋ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ಕಾರಣದ ಮೇಲೆಯೋ ಏನಾದರೂ ದರವನ್ನು ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶೆಮಾಡಿ ಅಂದರೆ, ಅವರು protest ಹಾಕಿದರೆ, 'Government have no business to play in the management of the Trust Board,' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ position ಏನು? ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಯಾವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲೇ ಆಗಲಿ supremacy of Government ಎಂಬುದು ಇರಬೇಕು. ಅದಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಯಾವ ಪರಿಣಾಮವನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆಂದರೆ, ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್‌ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಕೊಂಬೆ ಮರದ ಮೇಲೆಯೇ ನವಾಲು ಹಾಕಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಿಂದ ಫ್ರೀ ಸೈಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದನ್ನು ನಮಗೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಡಿ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲೇ 'ನಿಮಗೊಂದು ಫ್ರೀಯಾಗಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ನಮಗೊಂದು ಫ್ರೀಯಾಗಿ ಇರಲಿ' ಎಂದು reconcile ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಯಾರಾರ ಕೈವಾಡ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಅವರಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅಲ್ಲೊಂದು ಸೈಟು, ಇಲ್ಲೊಂದು ಸೈಟು ಎಂದು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡು ಸರಿಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಇನ್ನು ಮಿಕ್ಕವರಿಗೇನು ಗತಿ? There are what are called unorganised

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್.)

communities whose voice is not sufficiently heard by the Government and they are not properly represented owing to various reasons. ಅಂಥವರ ಗತಿ ಯೇನು ? ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಫ್ರೀ ಸೈಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವು ದರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು limit ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಸರ್ಕಾರ ದವರು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು decentralise ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗಲೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಧಿ ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಕಳಚಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ provided ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಯೋ for the purposes of ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಯೋ ಪಿನಾ ಯಿತಿಯಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸು ತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad that the members who just spoke have supported the amendment suggested by me. I wish to refer to one or two points raised by Sri Anantaraman. He said that in place of (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*) in the proposed sections in the two Bills the figures (1), (2) and (3) should have been used. I agree to this.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Maddur).—The very words are repeated. Except for 1, 2 and 3 you have stated '*a*, *b* and *c*'.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—Sri Anantaraman seems to think that Government should not have the power even in cases of free grants. As per the original Bill, it was intended that every case of grant of site either free or for upset price should come to Government. Later, when we thought that this would seriously interfere with the powers of the Boards, Government wished to retain the power in respect of free grants only. I wish to mention, Sir, that in respect of the Local Self-governing Institutions like City and Town Municipalities and the Corporation of Bangalore, free grant or grant for upset price of immovable property requires approval of Government. These local bodies meet the acquisition, layout and other charges. Despite this, Government exercise some amount of control over them, In the cases of the Trust Boards, their schemes are financed by Government in the shape of advances and grants. So Government should have certain measure of control over the Trust Boards also. I know instances where the Bangalore Trust Board have recommended grant of sites at rates lower than those fixed by Government. No such instances pertaining to the Mysore Trust Board have so far come up. If the Trust Boards dispose of sites at lower rates the Government would stand to lose heavily on the schemes and it would indeed be difficult for the Board to repay the advances. To safeguard Government money, it was considered desirable to reserve certain powers in regard to free grants and grants at upset price.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—One clarification. The Hon'ble Minister is referring to sites in Kumara Park Extension. No doubt some sites have been recommended for lower price, but I may bring to his kind notice that those sites were not good sites. They have pits. So the cost of filling up those sites will usually be more than Rs. 500. Then the Trust Board recommended to Government that they would be sold for a lower price. I do not think the Trust Board have recommended good sites for lower price.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Those are all details which we need not discuss now.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—In the two Trust Board Acts, a lacuna of legal provision existed. To overcome this and to provide a legal basis for the grants either for upset price or free of cost, the amending bill has been brought.

As I have stated earlier, on further consideration, Government have thought it sufficient to retain power for themselves only in respect of cases of free grant. With regard to the original Bill, I wish to make it clear once again that the main consideration which weighed with Government was to safeguard Government money advanced to Trust Boards.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the City of Bangalore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1954 be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clauses. Clause 2. There is an amendment in the name of

Sri T. Mariappa and another in the name of the Hon'ble Minister in charge of the Bill. Both the amendments are exactly the same. I think Sri Mariappa will have no objection if I give preference to the member in charge of the Bill. So the Hon'ble Minister will move the amendment.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—I move :

'That in Clause 2, for sub-section (2) of Section 29, the following sub-section shall be substituted, namely :—

"(2) No free grant of movable or immovable property shall be made without the previous sanction of Government being obtained in this behalf."'

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'That in Clause 2, for sub-section (2) of Section 29, the following sub-section shall be substituted, namely : -

"(2) No free grant of movable or immovable property shall be made without the previous sanction of Government being obtained in this behalf."'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That Clause 2, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 1.

The question is .

"That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Title and Preamble.

The question is :

"That the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—I move :

"That the City of Bangalore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1954, as amended, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the City of Bangalore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1954, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

THE CITY OF MYSORE IMPROVEMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1954.

Motion to consider.

Sri T. CHANNIAH (Minister for Public Health and Local Self-Government).—I beg to move :

"That the City of Mysore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1954, be taken into consideration."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the City of Mysore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1954, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER. - Clause 2.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—Sir, I beg to move :

'That in Clause 2 for sub-section (2) of section 25, the following sub-section shall be substituted :

"no free grant of movable or immovable property shall be made without the previous sanction of the Government being obtained in this behalf."'

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'That in clause 2 for sub-section (2) of section 25, the following sub-section shall be substituted :

"no free grant of movable or immovable property shall be made without the previous sanction of the Government being obtained in this behalf."'

Motion was adopted.